

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the subject application in view of the following remarks and the appended Section 132 affidavit.

Claims 1-37 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 11, 21, 31 and 35 being independent. No claims are amended or canceled.

Claim Rejections under §102(a) (per Supplemental Rejection dated 3/31/08)

Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-23, 25-33 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(a) as being anticipated by the published document “Web Services Addressing (WS-Addressing) published on March 13, 2003 and authored by Bosworth et al. (Bosworth).

Applicant’s representatives have executed a Section 132 affidavit stating that the claimed subject matter disclosed in Bosworth was conceived and invented by the inventors of this application. It is noteworthy that five of the inventors listed on this application are authors of the Bosworth publication. Section 715.01(c).I. of the MPEP states that “an affidavit or declaration by applicant alone indicating that applicant is the sole inventor and that the others were merely working under his or her direction is sufficient to remove the publication as a reference under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) *In re Katz*, 687 F.2d 450, 215 USPQ 14 (CCPA 1982).” Therefore, the Bosworth publication is not available as prior art to this application.

Claim Rejections under §103(a)

Claims 4, 14, 24, 34, 36 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Bosworth in view of the published document “Web Services Coordination (WS-Coordination)” published September 2003 and authored by Cabrera et al. (Cabrera).

Claims 4, 14, 24, 34, 36 and 37 are all dependent claims. As stated above, Bosworth is now removed as prior art and therefore, independent claims 1, 11, 21, 31 and 35 are allowable.

Dependent claim 4 depends from independent claim 1 and is allowable by virtue of its dependency from allowable claim 1, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

Dependent claim 14 depends from independent claim 11 and is allowable by virtue of its dependency from allowable claim 11, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

Dependent claim 24 depends from independent claim 21 and is allowable by virtue of its dependency from allowable claim 21, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

Dependent claim 34 depends from independent claim 31 and is allowable by virtue of its dependency from allowable claim 31, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

Dependent claims 36 and 37 depend from independent claim 35 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 35, as well as for

the additional features that each recites.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability,

Applicant respectfully requests a call to discuss any remaining issues.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: May 19, 2008

By: /Dale G. Mohlenhoff/
Dale G. Mohlenhoff
Reg. No. 37,683
(509) 324-9256 x238

Robert G. Hartman
Reg. No. 58,970
(509) 324-9256 ext. 265